UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,536	06/09/2006	Toru Shoji	TAN-123	9992
	7590 11/04/200 COBERTS, LLP	EXAMINER		
ATTORNEYS.		WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P		
P.O. BOX 484 PRINCETON, NJ 08542-0484			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/582,536	SHOJI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	George P. Wyszomierski	1793				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/16	/09 (RCE, Amendment).					
·	action is non-final.					
·=	′ 					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-6,9,12,14,16 and 18-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1,3-6,9,12,14,16, and 18-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 16, 2009 has been entered. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12, 14, 16, and 18-20 are pending.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12, 14, 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krotz et al. (U.S. Patent 5,915,160) in view of Fustukian et al. (U.S. Patent 3,741,748).

Krotz et al. discloses a process substantially as claimed, i.e. forming a powder of a material that meets the limitations of instant claims 5, 6, 12, 14, 16 and 18-20 (such as gold and a dilute element such as a rare earth element), oxidizing this material in a ball mill, followed by consolidating (i.e. solidifying via heat and pressure). With regard to instant claims 4 and 9, this product can then be extruded; see Krotz column 3, lines 29-30.

Krotz generically employs a ball mill in the prior art process as opposed to the presently claimed "attritor with water". Fustukian column 5, lines 19-28 indicates that it was known at the time of the invention, that in the context of forming oxide-dispersed metal matrix composite materials, i) the use of attrition type mills is equivalent to the use of ball mills, ii) attrition type

mills are generally preferred, and iii) it is preferred to use wet milling. Fustukian therefore suggests modifying the Krotz process in accord with the invention as claimed with regard to the apparatus employed in such a process. With respect to claim 3, any water used in the prior art process is held to be "ultrapure" absent any specific definition of this term.

Thus, the combined disclosures of Krotz et al. and Fustukian et al. would have taught the method as presently claimed to one of ordinary skill in the art.

- 4. In remarks filed with the present RCE, Applicant alleges that specific distinctions exist between performing a process in a ball mill as opposed to an attritor, and/or that certain disclosures in the previously applied Newkirk reference render its combination with Krotz problematic. Applicant's arguments have been carefully reviewed and considered. It is believed that the newly cited Fustukian reference speaks much more directly to any alleged deficiencies in Krotz vis-à-vis the instant claims.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the <u>central facsimile number</u>, (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793